DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 604 RC 012 419

AUTHOR	Christner, Catherine A.: And Others
TITLE	Evaluation Design: ESEA Title I Migrant Program. Publication No. 80.02.
INSTITUTION	Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	66p.: For a related document, see ED 178 260.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Ancillary School Services: Educational Assessment: Elementary Secondary Education: *Evaluation Methods: *Evaluation Needs: Federal Aid: *Migrant Education: Migrant Health Services: Needs Assessment: Objectives: Parent Participation: Preschool Education: *Program Design: *Program Evaluation: Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Austin Independent School District TX: ESEA Title I Migrant Programs

ABSTRACT

The 1980-81 Austin Independent School District Title I Migrant Program for current and former migrant children operates at preschool through high school levels on an increased budget of $1,025,358 and centers around student recruitment and parent participation, a pre-K through high school instructional program, and health and clothing support services. Program evaluation will involve two major activities. The final report summary with its final technical report will provide decision information regarding the continuance, modification, or deletion of the program's instructional and other components. The annual evaluation report for the Texas Education Agency will document the achievement of program objectives. Both activities require detailed needs assessment, process, and outcome data from numerous sources. Information needs and sources are cross referenced in detail. A complete information dissemination schedule and an evaluation time resources allocation plan are included. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196604

Research and Evaluation

DEC 1980
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

EVALUATION DESIGN

ESEA Title I Migrant Program

Fall, 1980

Austin Independent School District

RC 012419

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ereda M Halley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Evaluator:
Catherine A. Christner, Ph.D.

Senior Evaluator:
Glynn Ligon, Ph.D.

Data Analyst:
Anna Beeson

Secretary:
Ruth Fairchild

EVALUATION DESIGN

ESEA Title I Migrant Program

Fall, 1980

Approved:

Freda M. Holley, Ph.D.
Director, Research and Evaluation

Publication No. 80.02

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND DISCLAIMER

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

80.02

PROGRAM STAFF

The following Austin Independent School District staff members are responsible for the implementation of the Title I Migrant Program.

Oscar Cantú
Title I/Title I Migrant Administrator

José Mata
Migrant Coordinator

Kathleen Bryan, R. N.
Family Nurse Practitioner

Alícia Talamántez
Migrant Parent Involvement Specialist

Timy Baranoff, Ph. D
Early Childhood Coordinator

EVALUATION DESIGN REVIEW FORM

The following persons have been provided an opportunity to review and to make comments on pertinent sections of this design:

John Ellis, Ph.D.
Superintendent

Mike Lehr
Administrative Assistant
to the Superintendent

Mauro Reyna
Assistant Superintendent,
Division of Educational Development

Lawrence Buford
Director, Secondary Education

Roberta Hartung
Acting Director, Elementary Education

Kay Killough
Assistant Superintendent,
Division of Instructional Services

Hobart Gaines, Ph.D.
Assistant Superintendent,
Division of Human Resources

James Jeffrey, Ph.D.
Assistant Superintendent,
Division of Planning and Management

Lee Laws
Director,
Department of Developmental Programs

Oscar Cantú
Administrator,
Title I/Title I Migrant

José Mata
Coordinator,
Title I Migrant

Kathleen Bryan, R. N.
Title I Migrant

Alícia Talamántez,
Parent Involvement Specialist
Title I/Title I Migrant

Ann Cunningham,
Title I Reading Supervisor

Timy Baranoff, Ph.D.
Coordinator,
Early Childhood Education

Districtwide Parental Advisory
Council Evaluation Subcommittee

Principals with a Migrant Teacher

II A

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Title I Migrant Program is a rapidly growing, federally funded project in the Austin Independent School District. It is designed to meet the unique needs of the District's migrant students. Funds to aid in the education of migrant students are made available to the states based on the number of students who are identified within each state. The Texas Education Agency then allocates the Texas funds to local districts based on district need and program quality. Both *currently migratory* and *formerly migratory* children may be served by the Migrant Program. A *currently migratory* child is one (a) whose parent or guardian is a migratory agricultural worker or migratory fisher, and (b) who has moved within the past 12 months from one school district to another to enable the child, the child's guardian, or a member of the child's immediate family to obtain temporary or seasonal employment in an agricultural or fishing activity. The term "agricultural activity" means "any activity related to crop production (including the preparation of soil and the storing, curing, canning, or freezing of crops); any activity related to the production and processing of milk, poultry, and livestock (for human consumption); and any operation involved in forest nurseries and fish farms." Students retain their currently migratory status for one year following their arrival in the school district. Students who remain in the district following their year of current eligibility are considered *formerly migratory* students (with the concurrence of the parents) for a period of five years. Currently and formerly migratory students are eligible for the same program services.

The level of funding for the Migrant Program in 1979-80 was $845,745. For the 1980-81 school year, the funding level has risen to $1,025,358.

The activities of the Migrant Program are centered around:

- recruitment of students and parental involvement
- an instructional program for pre-kindergarten through high school students
- health and clothing support services

Recruitment and Parental Involvement

In order to be eligible for the services provided by the Migrant Program, the parents (guardians) of the student have to complete a Certificate of Eligibility/Identification. In signing this form, the parents certify that their children meet the definition of migrant students. Students who are already certified with an Eligibility/Identification Form on file are eligible for services as formerly migratory students without filing another form. Using the previous year's list of migrant students and other community and school contacts, the Parental Involvement Specialist and the community representatives begin making home visits to register currently migratory students prior to the beginning of the school year. These home visits continue throughout the year as new migrant students are located and identified. When the Eligibility/Identification Forms are completed, they are sent by the MSRTS clerk to the Region XIII Education Service Center for entry into the MSRTS data bank in Little Rock, Arkansas.

The Migrant Program is also required by federal guidelines to establish Parent Advisory Councils (PACs) at each local campus with a Migrant teacher and for the District as a whole. The PACs provide the parents of migrant students and other community members with an opportunity to learn more about the Migrant Program. PACs also allow parents to advise the District in its operation of the Migrant Program and its planning for future Migrant activities. The establishing of the Districtwide and local PACs is the responsibility of the Austin Independent School District, the Department of Developmental Programs, and the Parental Involvement Office.

Pre-Kindergarten: The Migrant Program has nine pre-kindergarten classes. The pre-kindergarten program is for students who are four years old as of September 1, 1980. For 1980-81, two of the classes are funded fifty percent by Title I Migrant and fifty percent by Title I. These two split-funded classes are at Rosewood and Ridgetop. The other classes are located at Allison, Brooke, Dawson, Metz, Ortega, Sanchez, and St. Elmo. Each of the nine classes has a teacher and instructional aide. All of the classes except for the one at Metz have a part-time student aide who is made available through the local Home Economics Cooperative Education Program (HECE). The 1980-81 school year represents a transition year for curriculum. The bilingual curriculum developed by Southwest Educational Development Laboratory which was used in past years is being replaced by the AISD pre-kindergarten curriculum. The teachers may still use some of the bilingual curriculum materials to supplement the AISD curricula. Pre-K classes at Metz, Brooke, and Dawson are housed in portable buildings built with ESEA Title I Migrant funds.

Grades K-6: The Migrant Program funds seven teachers for K-6 students. The Migrant teachers serve the following campuses: Allan (Grades 1-3), Becker (Grades K-6), Brooke (Grades K, 4-6), Dawson (Grades K-6), Govalle (Grades K-3), Highland Park (Grades 1-3), and Webb (Grades 4-6). Due to desegregation, Migrant students are more scattered throughout the District than previously. They are also frequently not always in Title I schools (as generally the case in the past). The instructional emphasis will be a supplementary Oral/Written Communication Skills program in coordination with the regular instructional program.

Grades 7-12: There are six teachers funded by Title I Migrant at the secondary level. A teacher is located at each of the following campuses: Fulmore Junior High, Martin Junior High, O'Henry Junior High, Anderson High School, Johnston High School, and Travis High School. The instructional emphasis at Grades 7-12 will be Communication Skills.

Migrant students who attend campuses without a Migrant teacher may be served by other compensatory programs.

Health and Clothing Services:

The Migrant Program provides health and clothing benefits to migrant students who are in need of them. To receive these benefits, the migrant students must meet the low-income criterion (be eligible for the free or reduced lunch program). The Family Nurse Practitioner employed by the Migrant Program screens

and examines migrant students and makes referrals to physicians and dentists as needed. Funds from the Migrant Program are used to purchase glasses or to pay medical, dental, or lab fees when other resources are not available.

Clothing requests are initiated by the teachers and then signed by the school principals. The requests are then processed by the Parental Involvement Office. If a need is indicated and cannot be met through other community resources, the community representatives are responsible for purchasing and delivering the clothing.

II B

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The evaluation of the Migrant Program for 1980-81 focuses on the production of two major reports:

- The production of a Final Report Summary and its related Final Technical Report which present information relevant to the decision questions outlined in this document; and

- The production of an Annual Evaluation Report for the Texas Education Agency (TEA) which documents the extent to which program objectives have been achieved.

These activities require the collection of needs assessment, process, and outcome data.

Needs assessment data will be gathered in order to determine the number of students eligible for Migrant Program services, their locations, and their achievement levels.

Process data will be used to analyze the extent and efficiency with which program components have been implemented. Data in this category include interviews with the Migrant staff (Coordinator, Nurse, teachers, etc.); classroom observations; and analyses of PAC records, health services records, and clothing records.

Outcome data will indicate the extent to which the Migrant Program has had an impact on the achievement of migrant students. Among the measures will be the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, the California Achievement Tests, the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test.

III A
DECISION QUESTIONS ADDRESSED

Program Questions

D1. Should the Pre-K Instructional Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?

D2. Should the K-12 Instructional Component (Communication Skills) be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?

D3. Should the Health Services Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?

D4. Should the Parental Involvement Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?

D5. Should the MSRTS Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
D1. Should the pre-K instructional component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?	February and August, 1981	January and July, 1981	D1-1. Were the achievement objectives met?	a) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
			D1-2. How do the pre/posttest gains made by the migrant pre-K students on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test compare with the pre/posttest gains made by the Title I pre-K students?	a) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
			D1-3. How many pre-K students did Migrant teachers serve?	
			a) What number and percent of eligible pre-K students received services from a Migrant teacher?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			b) What was the average number of pre-K students seen daily by a Migrant teacher during each six-week period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			c) What was the average number of pre-K students served by a Migrant teacher during each six-weeks period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
			D1-3. (continued)	
			d) What was the average number of days of instruction received by pre-K students during each six-weeks period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			D1-4. How successful was the implementation of the pre-K component?	
			a) What concerns/strengths were identified by the Migrant teachers in the fall of 1980?	a) Migrant Teacher Interview, Fall
			b) What concerns/strengths were identified by the Migrant Coordinator in the fall of 1980?	a) Migrant Coordinator Interview, Fall
			c) What concerns/strengths were identified by the Early Childhood Coordinator in the fall of 1980?	a) Early Childhood Coordinator Interview, Fall
			d) Were concerns resolved by the end of the year? How? Were additional strengths noted?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire b) Migrant Coordinator Interview, Spring c) Early Childhoood Coordinator Interview, Spring

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

80.02

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
			D1-5. How did the implementation of the Migrant and Title I Early Childhood Programs compare in terms of time spent in instruction, curriculum use, average group size, amount of time spent with the teacher, etc?	a) Pre-Kindergarten Observations
			D1-6. How was the AISD Early Childhood curriculum accepted by the Migrant pre-K teachers? How does this compare with Title I pre-K teachers?	a) Levels of Use Interview
			D1-7. What supervision concerns were identified/resolved during 1980-81?	
			a) In the fall of 1980, were the Migrant pre-K teachers able to clearly identify their supervisors and describe the respective responsibilities of each?	a) Migrant Teacher Interview, b) Migrant Coordinator Interview, Fall c) Early Childhood Coordinator Interview, Fall
			b) Were the expectations of the Migrant pre-K teachers with regard to supervision fulfilled during the 1980-81 school year?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire b) Migrant Coordinator Interview, Spring c) Early Childhood Coordinator Interview, Spring

10

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

80.02

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
			D1-8. In what staff development activities did Migrant pre-K teachers participate? Who sponsored sessions attended by the teachers? D1-9. What have been the long-term effects of participation in the Migrant Pre-K component?	a) Migrant Teacher Interview, Fall b) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire, Spring

11

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

80.02

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
D2. Should the K-12 Instructional Component (Communication Skills) be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?	February and August, 1981	January and July, 1981	D2-1. Were the achievement objectives met?	
			a) Kindergarten	a) Boehm
			b) Grade 1	b) MRT ITBS
			c) Grades 2 - 6	c) CAT_{70} ITBS
			d) Grades 7 - 8	d) CAT_{78} ITBS
			e) Grades 9 - 12	e) CAT_{78} STEP
			D2-2. How many grade K-12 migrant students did Migrant teachers serve?	
			a) What number and percent of eligible K-12 students received services from a Migrant teacher?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			b) What was the average number of K-12 students seen daily by a Migrant teacher during each six-weeks period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			c) What was the average number of days of instruction received by K-12 students during each six-weeks period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form

12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
			d) What was the average number of days of instruction received by K-12 students during each six-weeks period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			D2-3. How did the total number of days of instruction compare (by grade level) for students scoring at the A achievement level (achievement test score is at or above the District median*), B achievement level (achievement test score is .01 to 1 year below the District median*), and C achievement level (achievement test score is 1.01 or more years below the District median*)? How did the number of days of instruction during each six-weeks compare?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form b) Boehm c) MRT d) ITBS e) STEP

*Where the District median is not available, a national median will be used.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

80.02

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
			D2-4. What number and percent of the students eligible for Migrant services received supplementary reading instruction from another source?	a) Student Master File b) Migrant Student Master File
			D2-5. How successful was the implementation of the K-12 component?	
			a) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant teachers in the fall of 1980?	a) Migrant Teacher Interview, Fall
			b) What concerns/strengths were identified by the Migrant Coordinator in the fall of 1980?	a) Migrant Coordinator Interview, Fall
			c) Were concerns resolved by the end of the year? How? Were additional strengths noted?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire b) Migrant Coordinator Interview, Spring
			D2-6. What supervision difficulties, if any, were identified/resolved during 1980-81?	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

80.02

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
			D2-6. (continued)	
			a) In the fall of 1980, were the Migrant K-12 teachers able to clearly identify their supervisors and describe the respective supervisory responsibilities of each?	a) Migrant Teacher Interview, Fall b) Migrant Coordinator Interview, Fall
			b) Were the expectations of the Migrant K-12 teachers with regard to supervision fulfilled during the 1980-81 school year?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire, Spring b) Migrant Coordinator Interview, Spring
			D2-7. In what staff development activities did Migrant K-12 teachers participate? Who sponsored sessions attended by the teachers?	a) Migrant Teacher Interview, Fall b) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire, Spring

15

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
D3. Should the Health Services Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?	February and August, 1981	January and July, 1981	D3-1. Were the component's objectives met?	a) Health Services Form b) Medical Expenses Form
			D3-2. How many migrant students (by grade) were served by the Migrant Nurse?	a) Health Services Form b) Medical Expenses Form
			D3-3. What services did migrant students receive?	a) Health Services Form b) Medical Expenses Form
			D3-4. What follow-up activities were conducted by the Migrant Nurse?	a) Migrant Nurse Interview, Fall b) Migrant Nurse Interview, Spring
			D3-5. Were any problems encountered in the implementation of the Health Services Component?	a) Migrant Nurse Interview, Fall b) Migrant Nurse Interview, Spring c) Migrant Teacher Interview, Fall d) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire, Spring
D4. Should the Parental Involvement Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?	February and August, 1981	January and July, 1981	D4-1. Were the component's objectives met? a) Local PAC's b) Districtwide PAC c) Home Visits d) Parent Training e) Clothing Services	a) Local PAC Data: Agenda, Minutes, Rosters b) Districtwide PAC Data: Agenda, Minutes, Rosters c) Parental Involvement Specialist Community Representative Interviews d) Clothing Requests Form e) Clothing Purchases Form

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
			D4-2. How many Districtwide and Local PAC meetings were held between August 1, 1980 and April 30, 1980?	a) Districtwide PAC Attendance Form b) Local PAC Attendance Forms
			D4-3. Did migrant students who received clothing attend school more than migrant students who did not receive clothing?	a) Clothing Purchases Form b) District Attendance Records c) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			D4-4. Did more Migrant parents attend Local and Districtwide PAC meetings during 1979-80 than they did during 1978-79?	a) Local and Districtwide PAC Data
			D4-5. Were any problems encountered in the implementation of the Parental Involvement Component?	a) Migrant Coordinator Interview, Fall b) Migrant Coordinator Interview, Spring c) Migrant Teacher Interview, Fall d) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire, Spring e) Parental Involvement Specialist and Community Representative Interview

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

80.02

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
D5. Should the MSRTS Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?	February and August, 1981	January and July, 1981	D5-1. Were the component's objectives met?	a) MSRTS records b) Migrant Coordinator/MSRTS Clerk Interview, Fall c) Migrant Coordinator/MSRTS Clerk Interview, Spring
			D5-2. Were any problems encountered with the implementation of the MSRTS Component?	a) Migrant Coordinator/MSRTS Clerk Interview, Fall b) Migrant Coordinator/MSRTS Clerk Interview, Spring c) Migrant Teacher Interview, Fall d) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire, Spring
			D5-3. Was information on the MSRTS system updated within appropriate timelines? Was the information on the MSRTS system readily retrievable? Was the information of the MSRTS system accurate?	a) MSRTS records (spot checks throughout year)
			D5-4. What are the costs of the MSRTS component to A.I.S.D. in comparison to the benefits of the system to A.I.S.D.?	a) Migrant Coordinator/MSRTS Clerk Interview, Fall b) Migrant Coordinator/MSRTS Clerk Interview, Spring c) MSRTS Records d) Migrant Teacher Interview, Fall e) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire, Spring
			D5-5. What are other districts' experiences with the MSRTS Component?	a) MSRTS Questionnaire

18

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IV A

INFORMATION NEEDS

A. Annual Evaluation Report for the Texas Education Agency, Summer Term, 1980 - Addendum

I1. How many migrant students were served by instructional and/or support components of the Migrant Program (by grade and ethnicity) during the summer term?

I2. To what extent have the objectives been attained?

B. Needs Assessment Document

I3. How many migrant students will be enrolled in each school (by grade) in the 1981-82 academic year?

I4. What is the achievement level of the migrant students by school and by grade? How many students at each grade level are at the A achievement Level (achievement test score is at or above the District median*), B achievement level (achievement test score is .01 to 1 year below the District median*), and C achievement level (achievement test score is 1.01 or more years below the District median*)? How do they compare with the District average?

I5. What compensatory programs serve migrant students at each grade for each school; how many migrant students are served by each?

I6. What health and clothing needs have been identified for the migrant students?

C. 1981-82 Title I Migrant Application to the Texas Education Agency

I7. How will the objectives in each of the components be evaluated?

I8. What are the proposed objectives for the 1981-82 evaluation component?

I9. What is the proposed budget for the 1981-82 evaluation component?

*Where the District median is not available, a national median will be used.

IV A

INFORMATION NEEDS

D. 1980-81 Annual Report to the Texas Education Agency

I10. How many migrant students (total) participated in instructional components funded by Title I Migrant during 1980-81?

I11. How many migrant students participated in support components funded by Title I Migrant during 1980-81?

I12. How many migrant students were served by instructional and/or support components of the Migrant Program (by grade and ethnicity) during 1980-81?

I14. How many students (by grade and by ethnicity) were involved in each instructional component?

I15. How many students received medical care provided through Migrant funds?

I16. How many students received dental care provided through Migrant funds?

I17. How many migrant students were pre- and posttested (by grade level)?

I18. What was the pretest normal curve equivalent mean score average (by grade level) for the migrant students pre- and posttested?

I19. What was the posttest normal curve equivalent mean score average (by grade level) for the migrant students pre- and posttested?

I20. What was the average normal curve equivalent gain (by grade level) for the migrant students pre- and posttested?

IV B

INFORMATION NEEDS OVERVIEW

INFORMATION NEED	DATE NEEDED	INFORMATION SOURCES
A. Annual Evaluation Report for the Texas Education Agency, Summer Term, 1980 - Addendum		
I1. How many migrant students were served by instructional and/or support components of the Migrant Program (by grade and ethnicity) during the summer term?	8-15-80 11-30-80	a) Migrant Student Master File b) Health Services Form c) Medical Expenses Form d) Summer School Rosters
I2. To what extent have the objectives been attained?	8-15-80 11-30-80	a) Health Services Form b) Medical Expenses Form c) Summer School Grade Reports (Grades 9-12) d) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Grades 1-6)
B. Needs Assessment Document		
I3. How many migrant students will be enrolled in each school (by grade) in the 1981-82 academic year?	2-1-81	a) Migrant Student Master File
I4. What is the achievement level of the migrant students by school and by grade? How many students at each grade level are at the A achievement Level (achievement test score is at or above the District median*), B achievement level (achievement test score is .01 to 1 year below the District median*), and C achievement level (achievement test score is 1.01 or more years below the District median*)? How do they compare with the District average?	2-1-81	a) Migrant Student Master File b) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test c) Boehm d) Metropolitan Readiness Tests e) California Achievement Tests (1970) f) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills g) California Achievement Tests (1978) h) Sequential Tests of Educational Progress

*Where the District median is not available, a national median will be used.

IV B

INFORMATION NEEDS OVERVIEW

80.02

INFORMATION NEED	DATE NEEDED	INFORMATION SOURCES
B. Needs Assessment Document (con't.)		
I5. What compensatory programs serve migrant students at each grade for each school; how many migrant students are served by each?	2-1-81	a) Student Master File
I6. What health and clothing needs have been identified for the migrant students?	2-1-81	a) Health Services Form b) Medical Expenses Form c) Clothing Purchases Form
C. 1981-82 Title I Migrant Application to the Texas Education Agency		
I7. How will the objectives in each of the components be evaluated?	2-10-81	a) 1981-82 Title I Migrant Application Draft
I8. What are the proposed objectives for the 1981-82 evaluation component?	2-10-81	a) 1981-82 Title I Migrant Application Draft
I9. What is the proposed budget for the 1981-82 evaluation component?	2-10-81	a) 1981-82 Title I Migrant Application Draft
D. 1980-81 Annual Report to the Texas Education Agency		
I10. How many migrant students (total) participated in instructional components funded by Title I Migrant during 1980-81?	7-1-81	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form

22

IV B

INFORMATION NEEDS OVERVIEW

80.02

INFORMATION NEED	DATE NEEDED	INFORMATION SOURCES
D. 1980-81 Annual Report to the Texas Education Agency (con't.)		
I11. How many migrant students participated in support components funded by Title I Migrant during 1980-81?	7-1-81	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
I12. How many migrant students were served by instructional and/or support components of the Migrant Program (by grade and ethnicity) during 1980-81?	7-1-81	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form b) Health Services Form c) Medical Expenses Form d) Clothing Purchases Form
I13. How many parents were involved in each component?	7-1-81	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form b) PAC Rosters
I14. How many students (by grade and by ethnicity) were involved in each instructional component?	7-1-81	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
I15. How many students received medical care provided through Migrant funds?	7-1-81	a) Medical Expenses Form
I16. How many students received dental care provided through Migrant funds?	7-1-81	a) Medical Expenses Form

23

IV B

INFORMATION NEEDS OVERVIEW

80.02

INFORMATION NEED	DATE NEEDED	INFORMATION SOURCES
D. 1980-81 Annual Evaluation Report to the Texas Education Agency (con't.)		
I17. How many migrant students were pre- and posttested (by grade level)?	7-1-81	a) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, October, 1980 Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, April, 1981 b) Boehm, September, 1980 Boehm, February, 1981 c) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, April, 1980 or California Achievement Tests,October-Dec., 1980 Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, April, 1981 d) California Achievement Tests(1970), March, 1980 or California Achievement Tests(1978), October-December, 1980 California Achievement Tests(1978), March, 1981
I18. What was the pretest normal curve equivalent mean score average (by grade level) for the migrant students pre- and posttested?	7-1-81	a) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test b) Boehm c) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills d) California Achievement Tests (1970) e) California Achievement Tests (1978)
I19. What was the posttest normal curve equivalent mean score average (by grade level) for the migrant students pre- and posttested?	7-1-81	a) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test b) Boehm c) Iowa Test of Basic Skills d) California Achievement Tests (1970) e) California Achievement Tests (1978)

24

IV B

INFORMATION NEEDS OVERVIEW

80.02

INFORMATION NEED	DATE NEEDED	INFORMATION SOURCES
D. <u>1980-81 Annual Evaluation Report to the Texas Education Agency</u> (con't.)		
I20. What was the average normal curve equivalent gain (by grade level) for the migrant students pre- and posttested?	7-1-81	a) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test b) Boehm c) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills d) California Achievement Tests (1970) e) California Achievement Tests (1978)

25

V

DISSEMINATION

INFORMATION	DISSEMINATION FORMAT	DATE	PERSONS RECEIVING
1. Evaluation Findings for 1979-80	a) Final Technical Report	August, 1980	School Board, Developmental Programs Staff, Migrant Staff at Texas Education Agency
	b) Final Report Summary	August, 1980	School Board, Developmental Programs Staff, Migrant Staff at Texas Education Agency
	c) Texas Education Agency Final Report	August 15, 1980	Texas Education Agency Migrant Staff
	d) Evaluation Findings Brochure	October, 1980	Districtwide PAC, Local PACs, Developmental Programs Staff, Migrant teachers and their principals
2. Summer School Evaluation, 1980	a) Summer School Report to Texas Education Agency	August 15, 1980 November, 1980	Texas Education Agency Migrant Staff
3. Evaluation Design, 1980-81	a) Outline of evaluation questions and data to be collected	October, 1980	Interested AISD staff including Dept. of Dev. Programs Staff
4. Interim Findings	a) Needs Assessment Document/ Program Application	February, 1981	Dept. of Dev. Programs Staff and Program Staff
	b) Informative memos	As appropriate throughout school year	Dept. of Dev. Programs Staff and Program Staff

VI
INFORMATION SOURCES

80.02

INFORMATION SOURCE	POPULATION	EVAL. QUES. REFERENCED	DATE COLLECTED	ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	REMARKS
1. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	Migrant pre-kindergarten students	D1-1, D1-2, I4, I17, I18, I19, I20	October, 1980 April, 1981	Analysis of covariance Other analyses to be determined. Some gains comparisons with Title I pre-K students.	Test individually administered to each migrant pre-K student
2. Boehm Test	Migrant kindergarten students	D2-1, D2-3, I4, I17, I18, I19, I20	September, 1980 February, 1981	Frequency distribution Some gains comparisons with Title I kindergarten students. Other analyses to be determined.	Data collected by System-wide Testing
3. Metropolitan Readiness Tests	Migrant first-grade students	D2-1, D2-3, I-4	September, 1980	Frequency distribution Other analyses to be determined.	Data collected by System-wide Testing
4. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	Migrant first through eighth graders	D2-1, D2-3, I2, I4, I17, I18, I19, I20	Feb., 1981 (Grades 7-8) April, 1981 (Grades 1-6)	Frequency distribution of gains (pre and post). A variety of other analysis techniques will be used.	Data collected by System-wide Testing
5. California Achievement Tests (1970)	Migrant students in grades 2 - 6 served by a Migrant teacher who did not have an achievement test score from the spring of 1980 - pretest makeups.	D2-1, D2-3, I4, I17, I18, I19, I20	October - December, 1980	Conversion to I.T.B.S. scores via the A.I.S.D. ITBS-CAT_{70} Equating study to be used in the gains comparisons on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills analyses listed above.	

27

VI
INFORMATION SOURCES

80.02

INFORMATION SOURCE	POPULATION	EVAL. QUES. REFERENCED	DATE COLLECTED	ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	REMARKS
6. California Achievement Tests (1978)	Migrant students served by a Migrant teacher in grades 7-12 who did not have an achievement test score from the spring of 1980-pretest makeups. All migrant students in grades 7-12 served by a Migrant teacher-posttest.	D2-1, D2-3, I4, I17, I18, I19, I20	October-Dec., 1980	Frequency distributions of gains (pre and post). A variety of other statistical techniques will be used.	
7. Sequential Tests of Educational Progress	Migrant students in grades 9 - 12.	D2-1, D2-3, I4, I17, I18, I19, I20	March 31, 1981	Frequency distribution and a a variety of other analysis techniques.	Data collected by System-wide Testing.
8. Migrant Teacher Interview, fall	All migrant teachers	DI-4, DI-7, DI-8, D2-5, D2-6, D2-7, D3-5, D4-5, D5-2, D5-4	October, November 1981	Content coding	
9. Levels of Use Interview	All Migrant and Title I pre-K teachers	D1-6	January, 1981	Content Coding and Levels of Use Analysis	
10. Migrant Teacher Questionnaire	All migrant teachers	D1-4, D1-7, D1-8, D2-5, D2-6, D2-7, D3-5, D4-5, D5-2, D5-4	March, April 1981	Content coding	
11. Migrant Nurse Interview, fall	Migrant Nurse	D3-4, D3-5	October, 1980	Content coding	
12. Migrant Nurse Interview, spring	Migrant Nurse	D3-4, D3-5	March, 1981	Content coding	
13. Migrant Parental Involvement Specialist and Community Representative Interview	Parental Involvement Specialist Community Representatives	D4-1, D4-5	February, 1981	Content coding	

28

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VI
INFORMATION SOURCES

80.02

INFORMATION SOURCE	POPULATION	EVAL. QUES. REFERENCED	DATE COLLECTED	ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	REMARKS
14. Migrant Coordinator and MSRTS Clerk Interview, Fall	Migrant Coordinator MSRTS Clerk	D1-4, D1-7, D2-5, D2-6, D4-5, D5-1, D5-2, D5-4	October, 1980	Content Coding	
15. Migrant Coordinator and MSRTS Clerk Interview, Spring	Migrant Coordinator MSRTS Clerk	D1-4, D1-7, D2-5, D2-6, D4-5, D5-1, D5-2, D5-4	March, 1981	Content Coding	
16. Early Childhood Coordinator Interview, Fall	Early Childhood Coordinator	D1-4, D1-7	October, 1980		
17. Early Childhood Coordinator Interview, Spring	Early Childhood Coordinator	D1-4, D1-7	March, 1981		
18. Pre-Kindergarten Longitudinal File	Achievement data on former migrant pre-K students	D1-9	April, 1981	Analysis of covariance and other analyses to be determined.	
19. Pre-Kindergarten Observations	All Migrant and Title I pre-K teachers	D1-5	November, 1980	Frequency distributions. Other analyses to be determined.	
20. Migrant Student Master File	All Migrant students	D4-2, I1, I3, I4	August, 1980 through May, 1981	Frequency distribution by school and grade. Merging with achievement test files to obtain migrant student achievement data.	

29

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VI
INFORMATION SOURCES

INFORMATION SOURCE	POPULATION	EVAL. QUES. REFERENCED	DATE COLLECTED	ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	REMARKS
21. Student Master File	All A.I.S.D. students	D2-4, I5	September, 1980 through May, 1981	Frequency distributions of migrant students who are served by other compensatory programs, are bussed for desegregation, and are Limited English Proficiency students.	
22. Migrant Student Attendance Form	All migrant students served by a migrant teacher.	D1-3, D2-2, D2-3, I10, I11, I12, I13, I14	August, 1980 through May, 1981	Frequency distirbutions by six-weeks periods. Comparisons by grade and by type of instruction.	
23. District Attendance Records	All A.I.S.D. students	D4-3	August, 1980 through May, 1981	Frequency Tallies	
24. PAC Data	Not Applicable	D4-1, D4-2, D4-3, D4-4, I-13	August, 1980 through April, 1981	Inspection Tallies	
25. Clothing Requests Form	All migrant students for whom clothing is requested	D4-1, D4-2	August, 1980 - April, 1981	Frequency Distribution Total by month.	
26. Clothing Purchases Form	All migrant students for whom clothing is purchased.	D4-1, D4-2, I-6, I-12	August, 1980 - April, 1981	Frequency Distribution Total by month.	
27. Health Services Form	All students served by the Migrant Nurse.	D3-1, D3-2, D3-3 I6, I12	August, 1980 - April, 1981	Frequency Distribution Total by month	
28. Medical Expenses Form	All migrant students for whom medical expenses were paid	F3-1, D3-2, D3-3, I6, I12	August, 1980 - April, 1981	Frequency Distribution Total by month.	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VI
INFORMATION SOURCES

80.02

INFORMATION SOURCE	POPULATION	EVAL. QUES. REFERENCED	DATE COLLECTED	ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	REMARKS
29. MSRTS Records	All migrant students on the MSRTS file.	D5-1, D5-3, D5-4, D5-5	October, 1980-April, 1981	To be determined	
30. MSRTS Questionnaire	Other school districts with Migrant Programs	F5-6	January, 1981	Content Coding	

31

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VII

DATA TO BE COLLECTED IN THE SCHOOLS

A. Students

October, 1980
April, 1981

1. *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test:* Administered to all migrant pre-K students.

October-December, 1980

2. *California Achievement Tests (1970):* Makeup pretests will be administered by migrant teachers to all migrant second through sixth graders who do not have achievement test scores from the spring of 1980. These will be the Reading subtests only.

October-December, 1980
March, 1981

3. *California Achievement Tests (1978):* Makeup pretests will be administered by migrant teachers to all migrant seventh through twelfth graders who do not have achievement test scores from the spring of 1980. Migrant teachers will administer the Reading Subtests in March to the students in grades 7-12 whom they have served during the school year.

B. Teachers

October, November, 1980

1. *Migrant Teacher Interview - fall:* The interview will be conducted by the Migrant Evaluator with all the Migrant teachers. Approximately one-half hour of time will be required for each interview.

January, 1981

2. *Levels of Use Interview:* The interview will be conducted by the Migrant Evaluator with all the Migrant and Title I pre-K teachers. Approximately one-half hour of time will be required for each interview.

VII

DATA TO BE COLLECTED IN THE SCHOOLS

B. Teachers (continued)

March, April, 1981

3. *Migrant Teacher Questionnaire - spring:* The questionnaires will be sent to all Migrant teachers. It will take 10 to 20 minutes to complete.

November, 1980 - April, 1981

4. *Pre-K Classroom Observations:* Approximately 93 full-day observations will be conducted in Migrant and Title I pre-K classrooms. Eight observations will be conducted in each Migrant pre-K classroom and three observations will be conducted in each Title I pre-K classroom.

August, 1980 - May, 1981

5. *Migrant Student Attendance Forms:* To be completed daily by the Migrant teachers and returned to the Migrant evaluator at the end of each six weeks.

VIII

EVALUATION TIME RESOURCES ALLOCATION

80.02

ACTIVITY	DIRECTOR	SENIOR EVALUATOR	EVALUATOR	PROGRAMMER	EVALUATION ASSISTANT	SECRETARY
Information Sources						
1. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	-	1.0	5	10	-	2
2. Boehm Test	-	.5	1	10	-	1
3. Metropolitan Readiness Tests	-	1.0	1	5	-	-
4. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	-	1.0	5	10	-	5
5. California Achievement Tests (1970)	-	.5	4	5	-	1.5
6. California Achievement Tests (1978)	-	1.0	7	10	-	2.5
7. Sequential Tests of Educational Progress	-	.5	3	7	-	2
8. Migrant Teacher Interview, fall	-	.25	7	-	-	2
9. Levels of Use Interview	-	.25	5	-	-	2
10. Migrant Teacher Questionnaire	-	.25	3	-	-	2
11. Migrant Nurse Interview, fall	-	-	.5	-	-	.5

34

VIII

EVALUATION TIME RESOURCES ALLOCATION

80.02

ACTIVITY	DIRECTOR	SENIOR EVALUATOR	EVALUATOR	PROGRAMMER	EVALUATION ASSISTANT	SECRETARY
Information Sources (continued)						
12. Migrant Nurse Interview, spring	-	-	.5	-	-	.5
13. Migrant Parental Involvement Specialist and Community Representative Interviews	-	.25	2	-	-	2
14. Migrant Coordinator and MSRTS Clerk Interview, fall	-	.25	1	-	-	.5
15. Migrant Coordinator and MSRTS Clerk Interview, spring	-	.25	.5	-	-	.5
16. Early Childhood Coordinator Interview, fall	-	-	.5	-	-	.5
17. Early Childhood Coordinator Interview, spring	-	-	.5	-	-	.5
18. Pre-Kindergarten longitudinal file	-	.5	2	5	-	-
19. Pre-Kindergarten Observations	-	1.0	12	20	-	15
20. Migrant Student Master File	-	.5	10	55	-	20
21. Student Master File	-	1.0	2	11	-	2

55

VIII

EVALUATION TIME RESOURCES ALLOCATION

ACTIVITY	DIRECTOR	SENIOR EVALUATOR	EVALUATOR	PROGRAMMER	EVALUATION ASSISTANT	SECRETARY
Information Sources (continued)						
22. Migrant Student Attendance Form	-	.50	8	15	-	20
23. District Attendance Records	-	.25	2	5	-	5
24. PAC Data	-	.25	3	-	-	4
25. Clothing Requests Form	-	-	1	1	-	2
26. Clothing Purchases Form	-	-	1	1	-	2
27. Health Services Form	-	-	1.5	2	-	3
28. Medical Expenses Form	-	-	1	1	-	2
29. MSRTS Records	-	1.5	5	-	-	2
30. MSRTS Questionnaire	-	1.5	5	-	-	5
Subtotal of Information Sources	-	14	100	173	-	107

VIII

EVALUATION TIME RESOURCES ALLOCATION

80.02

ACTIVITY	DIRECTOR	SENIOR EVALUATOR	EVALUATOR	PROGRAMMER	EVALUATION ASSISTANT	SECRETARY
Dissemination						
1. Summer School Report	-	.25	1	-	-	1
2. Brochure	-	.25	5	-	-	2
3. Evaluation Design	.25	1	6	-	-	4
4. Needs Assessment	.25	2	10	-	-	5
5. Program Application	.25	2	10	-	-	3
6. Informative Memos	.25	2	5	-	-	10
7. Final Report	.75	4	50	-	-	50
8. TEA Report	.25	.5	3	-	-	3
Subtotal of Dissemination	2	12	90	0		78
Administrative 1. Other Indirect Time Costs	1	12	40	15	-	45
TOTAL	3	38	230	188	-	230

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Will D. Davis, President

Nan Clayton, Vice President

Manuel Navarro, Secretary

Steve M. Ferguson — Peter W. Werner, M. D.

Ed Small — Jerry Nugent

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. John Ellis

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Dr. Freda M. Holley